

**CAREER LADDER AND TIERED LICENSURE
JUNE 25, 2014
MEETING NOTES**

Present: Rod Lewis, Chair; Linda Clark, Co-Chair, Senator John Goedde, Senator Janie Ward-Engelking; Representative Marc Gibbs, Representative Wendy Horman; Superintendent Tom Luna, Rob Winslow, Karen Echeverria, Wayne Freedman, Rod Gramer, Brian Smith, Geoffrey Thomas; and Senator Dean Mortimer, Representative Lance Clow, and Christina Linda (via telephone)

Others present: Rick Jones, Vice President, Idaho Education Association (IEA) (for Penni Cyr); Richard Westerberg (via telephone); Taylor Raney, State Department of Education; Marilyn Whitney and Tracie L. Bent, State Board of Education

Chairman Rod Lewis welcomed the committee and reviewed the day's agenda. He advised the committee that in lieu of the rigorous discussion and votes at the June 12 meeting, those items voted upon would be deemed decided. Mr. Lewis said that he intended to move forward and not revisit the past.

Linda Clark, Co-Chair, presented the finding of the Practitioner Committee which had been charged by the committee to review the 22 components of the Danielson Framework (Danielson), and to develop a definition of "proficiency." The Practitioner Group members were:

Sherry Adams, Principal (Melba)
Brian Smith, Teacher (Sandpoint)
Wendy Johnson, Supt. (Kuna)
Mike Friend, HR Director (Middleton)
Tracey Bent, OSBE
Linda Clark, Chair

Dr. Clark advised that she had hoped to have additional teachers present, but none were available. Dr. Clark followed the general rule to include no more than one person from any given school district. She described the group as "good thinkers" with much expertise on the Danielson model; three had been trained. Dr. Clark reviewed the committee's work:

Concepts

- ▶ DANIELSON MODEL WAS DESIGNED AS A GROWTH TOOL
- ▶ ADMINISTRATORS ARE BEING TRAINED IN ITS TENETS
- ▶ C. DANIELSON CONSIDERS BASIC, PROFICIENT, DISTINGUISHED AS "MEETS STANDARDS"

- ▶ Emphasizes that good teachers will “have some areas for improvement, live in proficient, and visit distinguished”
- ▶ Under the proposed tiered licensure system, all teachers will be required to have annual improvement plans (IPLP)
- ▶ All annual evaluations require formal observations by a minimum of two trained evaluators

The Work

- ▶ Looked at the 22 required areas of Danielson
 - ▶ Areas that should have more weight
 - ▶ The model is soundly researched and widely used
 - ▶ Potential areas for “meets/not met” (yes/no”)
 - ▶ Variety of teaching responsibilities make this difficult (i.e. PTE courses)
- ▶ Considered other elements that might be considered
- ▶ Consensus that the task is to define PROFICIENCY for movement on Tiered Licensure Model

“Residency” or Novice Tier

- ▶ Teachers come from the universities with “Basic” proficiency in all 22 Danielson elements
- ▶ Recommend Committee reconsider making it a true “residency”
 - ▶ Three years maximum
 - ▶ No additional time for those who do not reach proficiency requirement

Dr. Clark said that the three year maximum period was recommended by the superintendents who suggested that the “residency” period be used as a clearing house. They had questioned why the State would grant a professional license if a candidate was not proficient. Brian Smith added that if a reasonable standard is set for three years, then candidates should be able to meet it; if not, they would need to go back to university. Dr. Clark affirmed that meeting the criteria to move to the next level is attainable in three years.

Initial Move from Novice to Professional Tier

- ▶ Definition of Proficient to move to Professional License(2 of 3 years, including year 3)
 - ▶ Must have 16 or more of Danielson elements marked as Proficient or higher
 - ▶ No more than 6 elements marked as Basic
 - ▶ No more than 2 elements marked as Basic in any domain
 - ▶ No elements marked as Unsatisfactory

Dr. Clark said that the committee had talked about how the districts report proficiency ratings for every teacher through the Idaho System for Instructional Excellence (ISEE). That system assigns points for basic, proficient and distinguished, but the committee was not comfortable with simple averaging.

Re-Licensure on Professional Tier

- ▶ Definition of Proficiency to re-certify on Professional Tier
 - ▶ Must have 18 or more Danielson elements marked as Proficient
 - ▶ No more than 4 elements marked as Basic
 - ▶ No more than 2 elements marked as Basic in any domain
 - ▶ No elements marked as Unsatisfactory
- ▶ Consequences of Failing to Demonstrate Proficiency
 - ▶ Renewal of Certificate with QUALIFIER(S)
 - ▶ Can be removed when requirements are met
- ▶ Process can be appealed to PSC, but not the evaluation itself

Move from Professional to Master Teacher Tier

- ▶ MINIMUM TO MOVE TO MASTER TIER IS 8 YEARS
 - ▶ 3 YEARS ON NOVICE TIER
 - ▶ 5 YEARS ON PROFESSIONAL TIER
- ▶ REQUIREMENTS FROM TAC ADOPTED BY COMMITTEE PLUS
 - ▶ PERFORMANCE ELEMENTS (3 of 5 years, including the 5th year)
 - ▶ NO elements marked as basic
 - ▶ PERFORMANCE ELEMENTS (Last 5 years)
 - ▶ No District Performance Improvement Plan or Probation
 - ▶ No QUALIFIER on certificate

Dr. Clark explained that if this system were fully implemented, it would contain three types of improvement plans:

- Individual Professional Improvement Plan(IPLP) which every teacher would have;
- Qualifer (for failing to demonstrate proficiency upon renewal)
- Standard probationary improvement plans

Rod Lewis directed the committee to Tier 1 for discussion of the presentation. He particularly liked the word “residency” to describe this level. He asked the committee to discuss how many of the elements need to be fulfilled to move from one level to the next.

Dr. Clark said that 16 “proficient” on the Danielson model would represent approximately 80 percent. An IPLP would need to address any “basics”. Karen Echeverria asked why the committee recommended that those 16 must be earned in the 3rd or final year of the novice level; Dr. Clark replied that this committee had decided at the last meeting that such a requirement would help to identify a teacher who was “sliding.”

Superintendent Luna said that when the State Department of Education (SDE) Technical Advisory Committee was considering the proper time frame, it had operated on the assumption that most new teachers would not meeting the professional tier standard in three years, but instead would require five years, which is why TAC had focused on proficient ratings on all 22 components of the Danielson. Chairman Lewis said that the

committee had voted on five years at the June 12 meeting and he would not revisit the time period: the novice level would remain at five years.

Superintendent Luna continued that TAC had felt that basic was a low bar. He read a definition of basic from Danielson Domain 3d, Using Assessment in Instruction:

Students appear to be only partially aware of the assessment criteria, and the teacher monitors student learning for the class as a whole. Assessments are rarely used to diagnose evidence of learning. Feedback to students is general, and few students assess their own work.¹

Dr. Clark replied that the superintendents felt proficient was unrealistic and inappropriate if an IPLP is used as it was designed for teacher improvement. Her committee further discussed whether or not the standard should be applied to all four domains equally, but could not reach consensus. She said that the practitioners understood that continuing contracts could be signed with a profile of a few basics, and felt that reflected reality. The superintendents noted that any unsatisfactory ratings result in a probationary improvement plan, and teachers tend to “take care of business”. For this reason, the superintendents were comfortable with a few basics.

Karen Echeverria noted that if the State adopts a five year initial period, it would be in conflict with the four year contract period. Dr. Clark acknowledged that the law would need to be changed.

Senator Goedde said that the lower the bar, the less chance of support in the legislature.

Rod Lewis asked the committee to consider the definition of a “reasonable bar”. Is the number 16 too low? Should the standard require no more than one basic in any one domain? He felt that moving from residency to professional is the appropriate place for a higher bar, a very solid bar. Brian Smith said that professional certificate renewal requires 18 proficient which recognizes that teachers continue to show growth.

Dr. Clark expressed concern that if a teacher is not proficient in all 22 at the end of three years, s/he would be replaced with someone brand new, and questioned where superintendents would want to devote their time. Wayne Freedman felt that proficient on all 22 components would detract from teacher evaluations – a principal would be weakened in his/her ability to point out areas for improvement. Dr. Clark agreed that her committee wanted a system in which principals were not forced to rate higher in order to retain a teacher who is “pretty good at most things.”

Brian Smith added that some definitions are poor. A teacher might transition to a new grade level and perform on a basic level because of it. An allowance needs to be included for that type of situation. He said that the Practitioner Committee also looked at safety, which in many cases could be rated as “safe” or “not safe”. But if the class was welding,

¹ Danielson, Charlotte, Framework for Teaching, 2013 Edition

safety would be a greater issue which is why the committee wanted to allow administrators some flexibility.

Rod Gramer expressed his regard for the superintendents on the Practitioner Committee and suggested an alternate proposal: a move from residency to professional would require 18 proficient; renewal of professional would require 20 proficient, and the basics could not be in the same domain. That proposal would allow a high bar with flexibility.

Dr. Clark asked the legislators their opinion of an acceptable bar for the legislature to grant funding on the career ladder. Senator Goedde said he supported Rod Gramer's concept. Representative Gibbs agreed that the Joint Finance-Appropriations Committee (JFAC) will need a very high bar to grant funding. Representative Horman said that the legislature will need to grapple with the issue of whether or not funding will produce better teaching and learning. Senator Ward-Engelking said that she liked the new idea because of its sense of some basics. She recently met with STEM teachers and they were very concerned because the fields of math and science do not operate on absolutes, or 100 percent.

Rod Gramer noted that even in the private sector, a star employee is not 100 percent; room for growth exists even at the top. Superintendent Luna added that the committee should not confuse proficiency with "no room for growth," however he said that he would have a difficult time moving a teacher forward who was basic in assessments. Christina Linder said that in an area that really matters, a basic cannot be allowed to continue – it must be improved. She said that she would like to see all proficient in Domains 2 and 3, but would be willing to have some basic in Domains 1 and 4. Brian Smith said that the Practitioner Committee recognized that even in Domains 2 and 3, a situation could result in a basic rating, so the committee added the limit of no more than 2 basic in any domain.

Rod Lewis suggested that the committee focus on 18 proficient, with no more than 1 basic in any domain. Geoffrey Thomas and Senator Ward-Engelking reflected back on their own teaching careers and worried that the proposed high bar might have ended their careers early if no flexibility was offered to administrators. Christina Linder said that until a few years ago, obtaining a teachers license was little more than a rubber stamp, with little rigor or performance outcomes in the process. The universities now offer a different experience and prepare candidates for success within a different context. Superintendent Luna agreed and added that since the bar had been raised at the university level, higher performance can be expected at the entry level.

Chairman Lewis suggested tightening the time frame of residency to three years, which would solve the contract issue and raise the bar. The committee debated the pros and cons of 16 versus 18 proficient ratings, and the balance of basic ratings between the 4 domains. Brian Smith said that the Practitioner Committee had looked thoroughly at the Danielson, and had discussed greater flexibility on Domains 1 and 4, but the practitioners felt it better to have a consistent standard. Representative Horman agreed, adding that the standard needs to have growth ability where growth is needed. Senator Ward-Engelking said she was uncomfortable with three years because Charlotte Danielson says it takes five years;

she could be comfortable with three to five years, but not with just three because much depends on the demographics of the classroom. Brian Smith and Karen Echeverria responded that if teachers were not meeting a reasonable standard, they would be counseled out and/or their contract would not be renewed. The original proposal was revised accordingly. Tom Luna suggested a time frame of four years. Senator Goedde said he favored 18 proficient in five years. Brian Smith objected that the original five year term previously approved was now being re-considered. Chairman Lewis called for a vote on the revisions:

- ▶ Definition of Proficient to move to Professional License (2 of 3 years, including year 3)
 - ▶ Must have 16 or more of Danielson elements marked as Proficient or higher
 - ▶ No more than 6 elements marked as Basic
 - ▶ No more than 2 elements marked as Basic in Domain 1 and 4
 - ▶ No more than 1 element marked as Basic in Domain 2 and 3
 - ▶ No elements marked as Unsatisfactory

The proposal passed 14-2. Senator Goedde and Superintendent Luna voted against the proposal.

Chairman Lewis next called for a discussion on Re-Licensure on Professional Tier. The language was revised to conform with the move to Professional Tier. Representative Gibbs and Brian Smith voiced the same concerns as earlier. Chairman Lewis called for a vote on the revised language:

- ▶ Definition of Proficiency to re-certify on Professional Tier
 - ▶ Must have 18 or more Danielson elements marked as Proficient
 - ▶ No more than 4 elements marked as Basic
 - ▶ No more than 2 elements marked as Basic in Domain 1 and 4
 - ▶ No more than 1 elements marked as Basic in Domain 2 and 3
 - ▶ No elements marked as Unsatisfactory
- ▶ Consequences of Failing to Demonstrate Proficiency
 - ▶ Renewal of Certificate with QUALIFIER(S)
 - ▶ Can be removed when requirements are met
- ▶ Process can be appealed to PSC – final certification appeal process to be determined once all components are complete.

The proposal passed 10-3. Senator Ward-Engelking, Representative Horman and Brian Smith voted against the proposal.

Taylor Raney presented TAC's proposed movement from Professional Tier 2 to Master Tier 3 Licensure. He advised that TAC had not voted on the entire language, nor had the out-of-state or maintenance sections been written.

Tier 3 Recommendations

To qualify for a Tier 3 certificate, all requirements for Tier 2 (IPLP, Danielson, student achievement, credits) must first be met. Teachers must have taught a minimum of five years, two of which must be while serving as a Tier 2 certificate-holder*. To reach Tier 3, teachers may choose one of the following performance-based pathways:

- Pathway 1 – National Board Certification, understanding that within that process rests several opportunities to demonstrate personal professional growth, as well as growth of student achievement.
- Pathway 2 – Approved advanced degree, defined as those pertaining to content in the teacher's certification area (or intended endorsement area), pedagogy appropriate for the certification, administration. Out-of-state advanced degrees must be granted by a regionally accredited institution of higher education.
- Pathway 3 - Consulting teacher/teacher leader endorsement (may be met through alternative endorsement)

Candidates for Tier 3 must also meet the below stipulations:

- student achievement – three consecutive years of student achievement/growth, as defined by the local school district
- a yet-to-be-determined number of “distinguished” components in each of the four Danielson domains during three consecutive years
- service to the profession: serving in a capacity that brings instructional value to the district beyond the individual's classroom

Out of state:

Pathways 2 and 3 - districts may apply for a provisional X-year Tier 3 certification for teachers with a minimum 5 years successful contracted experience, to provide opportunity for the candidate to demonstrate Tier 3 competencies.

Maintenance of Tier 3 certification is contingent on maintenance of the above stipulations for entry to the tier at the time of renewal.

*Except in the first year of Tier 3 availability, when only one year on Tier 2 would be necessary.

The committee discussed the language. Concerns included:

- Five versus eight years on the professional level;
- Non-master's candidates who have done extensive additional coursework;
- Fairness and equal availability to everyone;
- Whether National Board Certification increases student achievement;
- Role of student achievement in determining a master teacher;
- Distinction between leadership premiums qualification and master teacher;
- Length of time a teacher would hold a master teacher designation; and
- Whether or not a master teacher is a certificate or a separate license.

Brian Smith suggested that if it takes a teacher eight years to be able to apply for master teacher status, then once attained, the length of time should be more than one year. Superintendent Luna suggested that the master tier might exist within the Tier 2 license; it would be easier to move from one level to the next without involving a property right. Senator Ward-Engelking suggested that master teachers who have outstanding student achievement levels should be encouraged to stay in the classroom and teach, rather than take on additional duties.

Linda Clark suggested a two tier licensure with a three tier career ladder: once in professional licensure, a teacher would be eligible for tiered differentiated compensation; what happens in the classroom is based on student achievement on an annual basis, and performance dictates what can be earned.

Representative Clow suggested using the leadership premium to pay for specific duties and responsibilities that each district identifies, and as long as a teacher performs those duties, the teacher is compensated for them. He suggested more funding for leadership premiums.

Rick Jones said that if the State is providing a mechanism for teachers to earn compensation, it must be available to all teachers. The State cannot, by definition of job description, eliminate a group, such as those without classroom responsibilities, e.g., counselors, librarians and speech pathologists. He also questioned how socioeconomic factors would influence student achievement.

Rod Lewis summarized the discussion so far: Idaho would have a Residency tier and a Professional Tier, with recertification in the Professional Tier. A teacher who does not meet recertification standards would receive a “qualified” recertification with an improvement plan. Mr. Lewis thought it was useful to think of a standard professional and a master teacher but questioned whether it would be an endorsement within the Professional tier or a separate license. Dr. Clark reiterated her recommendation to meld the two systems: a two-tiered licensure with differentiated compensation. She thought it made a big difference in the operation and complexity of the system to have a third tier. Wayne Freedman agreed.

Senator Mortimer said that tiered licensure should be tied to compensation; he thought the committee should address licensure first, then compensation. The districts need to have some control over compensation. Brian Smith replied that if a teacher needs to meet conditions to get into Tier 4, that teacher should expect to be there and stay there; if it is not tied to compensation, there is no purpose for it.

Rod Lewis affirmed that licensure is tied to career ladder: if they are separate issues, why bother with the tier work. The committee is trying to lay a foundation in a tier system that drives the compensation system. Dr. Clark said that having a master teacher classification and being identified as “master teacher” is motivating. She agreed with the notion of a distinction that a teacher had earned through time. Administrators would be looking for trends, but year-to-year would be more difficult.

Wayne Freedman proposed that if a teacher worked for five years to attain the master designation and continued to meet year-to-year goals, then each year at that performance level would carry the master distinction. However, if a teacher chose to take family leave, for example, that teacher could drop back. He questioned how the legislature would budget for that. Rod Lewis agreed. If teachers move in and out, the system is not dependable or stable. He wants teachers to build, grow and maintain.

Both Senator Ward-Engelking and Superintendent Luna shared the view that a third tier license brings in property rights which cannot be taken away without due process. They agreed that a third tier might not be the best direction.

Dr. Clark pointed out that the original Task Force linked Tiered Licensure with the Career ladder: a teacher would stay on the tier and in that compensation level for the entire five years of the renewal period. It would be hard for the State to manage a system that changes every three or five years.

Superintendent Luna voiced concern about the quality and demographics of students; when the focus is on growth, those concerns are removed. As Rick Jones pointed out, every teacher needs the ability to achieve master level. By keeping the master designation within the Professional tier, every teacher has the opportunity to achieve it, but not all will. Those that do will have the opportunity for increased compensation. Others will have the opportunity for leadership premiums.

Rod Gramer stated the fundamental question: does the committee want a 3rd Tier?

Dr. Clark provided some history from the original Task Force which was tasked with identifying barriers to reaching the State's 60% Goal.² Fiscal instability was identified as one of those barriers. The Task Force concluded that the most destabilizing factors were operational funding and the manner in which the state compensated teachers in an ever-changing workforce. The Fiscal Stability Subcommittee looked at several compensation models and adopted career ladder as the most stable. Dr. Clark then cautioned the committee that whatever recommendation it makes must be aligned with improving stability so that districts can move toward the 60% goal. The committee's work is not to develop a salary schedule.

Representative Horman said she views annual performance as a key to securing significant levels of performance. She felt that the legislature would need some sort of assurance that a different approach was being implemented that would not allow teachers to "coast out to retirement." She also thought that property right issues would be amplified in Tier 3.

Rod Lewis replied that a consistent system needs to have more than one year attached to it; people need to be at levels for more than one year to achieve stability.

² 60% of Idahoans ages 24-35 to have a postsecondary certificate or degree by the year 2020.

Representative Clow questioned the definition of career ladder and career ladder compensation, because the legislature wants to get away from “steps and lanes.” He does not believe everyone should receive the same amount. If a teacher is outstanding, then s/he receives a larger raise. Rod Gramer agreed. He suggested a base level at Residency, at Tier 2 and at Tier 3, but if a teacher “coasts”, s/he is not making raises. Create a high bar to attain each level and tie compensation to performance.

Rod Lewis again turned to the viability of Tier 3. He said that it is important that Idaho has a tiered licensure system that is tied to career ladder so that when different levels are attained or achieved, it would drive a level on the ladder. Linda Clark explained that initially it was thought of as a separate license, but over several weeks, and in conversation with Superintendent Luna, Tier 3 became a master designation within Tier 2 to avoid the property right issues and complexities that would attach. Superintendent Luna added that the Tier 3 concept had started out as a “given” and a teacher could be moved down, but that had become a deal-breaker in TAC for the IEA, so the discussion then moved to a master designation within Tier 2. Superintendent Luna said he did not have a problem with that designation, and it carried no expectation that a teacher would retain that designation.

Brian Smith said that he had a security concern if the master designation could so easily be removed. Representative Horman replied that she did not want a teacher on autopilot at a high salary level.

Rod Lewis explained that Pay for Performance means that every year a teacher makes his/her pay. This committee has not been given that model to develop. It has been charged with developing Career Ladder. One way to get there is a master’s designation. If it does not remain for at least 3-5 years, then it is jumping up and down every year.

Brian Smith suggested that master level is performance at that level. He suggested “leap-frog pay.” A teacher needs to earn it and is compensated for those years s/he worked to earn it. Wayne Freedman suggested that the term for qualifying could drive the length of the compensation.

Rod Lewis said that student achievement is very important, and questioned how much weight student achievement should carry in a master designation. The committee reviewed the Practitioner Committee recommendation:

- ▶ MINIMUM TO MOVE TO MASTER TIER IS 8 YEARS
 - ▶ 3 YEARS ON NOVICE TIER
 - ▶ 5 YEARS ON PROFESSIONAL TIER
- ▶ REQUIREMENTS FROM TAC ADOPTED BY COMMITTEE PLUS
 - ▶ PERFORMANCE ELEMENTS (3 of 5 years, including the 5th year)
 - ▶ NO elements marked as basic
 - ▶ PERFORMANCE ELEMENTS (Last 5 years)
 - ▶ No District Performance Improvement Plan or Probation
 - ▶ No QUALIFIER on certificate

The committee discussed student achievement and student growth at length.

Rob Winslow suggested that this recommendation should mirror the logic of the other two tiers because student achievement is already in the Danielson Framework as “achieving superior student output.” Rod Gramer and Geoff Thomas also favored student growth but found difficulty with its definition.

At the present time, Idaho cannot measure growth because it does not have growth measures, and the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) test only measures English and Math, not other subjects.

Dr. Clark said that the West Ada School District uses Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) testing and she believes the SBAC will align to the MAP test. Representative Horman also expressed faith in the Idaho Core Standards and SBAC testing. Geoff Thomas disagreed.

Tom Luna and Dr. Clark discussed an appropriate measure for distinguished teachers meeting growth measures, and agreed that 60% held a strong correlation.

The committee discussed the Danielson Framework to choose the number of “distinguished” designations a teacher would need to qualify for the master level. Rod Gramer pointed out that the first teacher cannot apply for five years so the SBAC would have time to be measured. Senator Ward-Engelking said that it would take new teachers eight years; she wanted more research on the 60% growth targets because the SBAC only measures English and Math and she would not want teachers to be discouraged from entering those fields due to SBAC growth measures.

Wayne Freedman questioned whether service to the profession should be a component or not. He wrestles with whether a master teacher should have an impact on the rest of the teachers at a time when the profession is moving more to team teaching and project based learning. He wants them to have team building skills, but on the other side, it takes time away from the classroom which is where they demonstrate mastery.

Rod Gramer replied that the TAC has agreed that school leaders would be best to define these roles, and he has faith in the superintendents and principals to make those assignments. Brian Smith replied that he would want leadership money to fund those activities.

The committee revised the Tier 3 qualifications to read:

- ▶ MINIMUM TO MOVE TO MASTER TIER IS 8 YEARS
 - ▶ 3 YEARS ON NOVICE TIER
 - ▶ 5 YEARS ON PROFESSIONAL TIER
- ▶ Tier 3 (Master) Requirements
 - ▶ 3 years renewable
 - ▶ PERFORMANCE ELEMENTS (3 of 5 years, including the 5th year)

- ▶ NO elements marked as basic
- ▶ No QUALIFIER on certificate
- ▶ No less than 6 distinguished ratings
 - ▶ 4 out of the six must be in Domains 2 and 3
- ▶ 60 percent of students meet or exceed their growth targets where applicable
- ▶ PERFORMANCE ELEMENTS (Last 5 years)
 - ▶ No District Performance Improvement Plan or Probation
- ▶ REQUIREMENTS FROM TAC ADOPTED BY COMMITTEE PLUS (Still to be determined)

Referring back to the Tier 3 Recommendation from TAC, Senator Goedde said that Pathways 1 and 2 were irrelevant. The other suggestions were better, but he thinks the legislature will want to be convinced that those elements contribute to student achievement.

Representative Gibbs suggested that three years be the measure to earn Master designation with three years to keep it. Senator Goedde suggested three years rolling: earned for three years, but in 4th year if not earned, then a teacher has two years remaining. Representative Gibbs suggested that anytime a teacher earns master status three years in a row, s/he qualifies, as long as it is based on student growth.

Having exhausted the meeting's time limit, Rod Lewis adjourned the meeting until July 14, 2014.